

from it is certainly welcomed, certainly by me and I think many on both sides of the aisle.

The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House are well suited to continue receiving lobby registration forms. These offices can improve the dissemination of this information, making it more user friendly for the public. That is what our alternative aims to do.

As far as the executive branch coverage, an item we are still discussing here as we hope to work this matter out, my view is it is just not necessary. Contacts with the executive branch are highly regulated under the Administrative Procedure Act. Regulations are formulated by a very detailed process that allows interested parties to participate. And Congress always has oversight and legislative power over regulations issued by Agencies. Administrative adjudication is also a formal process.

Moreover, we know from the experience of the health care task force run by the First Lady that efforts by the executive branch to make policy in secret generally backfire anyway. And a legal challenge has resulted in that particular case in all of that information becoming public.

So, Mr. President, from our point of view, we should clean up our own house. Let us get the right coverage of lobbyists who lobby us here in the Congress. Let us get information related to their work properly available and disclosed to the public. Let us not make registration and disclosure so cumbersome that we signal to the American people that their voices are simply not welcome here in Washington. We want their input. We encourage Americans to join organizations that represent their views, and we hope they will let us know what they think.

When James Madison wrote Federalist No. 10, he envisioned a competition of ideas from, as he put it, "factions." Today, we would call those factions lobbyists. We who are elected to represent our constituents are called upon to build consensus among the various factions. Where we are unable to build consensus, we are called upon to choose from among the competing ideas put forward by the lobbyists or, if you will, the factions.

So there is nothing wrong with lobbying. It is not an evil thing. It was envisioned by the Framers. It is part of our Constitution's first amendment which protects free speech and petitioning the Government with grievances.

And finally, while lobbying is an honorable profession, we want to make sure that those who abuse the public trust they hold as lobbyists are punished for their misdeeds. We propose to let the U.S. attorney prosecute those who violate the law. The first offense would be subject to civil sanctions and subsequent offenses would be subject to criminal penalties. We want lobbyists to register; we want their activities

disclosed, but let us not chill protected constitutional rights in the process.

Mr. President, the discussions on this matter are proceeding. And again, let me say we are hoping we can achieve at least close to a consensus on the lobby disclosure bill which we can pass by an overwhelming margin sometime later today or tonight.

Mr. President, I do not see anyone else wishing to address the Senate. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCAIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there are active negotiations underway on language in the lobby reform bill. I think we are making progress and some important changes and agreements have already been reached. There are a few areas where, obviously, there is still some disagreement or some lack of clarity as to what it would do.

Since the principals are here on the floor, it would be helpful, I believe, if we go ahead and recess until a time certain to allow the principals in this legislation to talk directly.

Also, we hope, when we come back in after that recess, we will be able to get an agreement on a specified time, agreed-to time to vote on or in relation to the McCain amendment. It may be other amendments will be ready at that time, but at least we would like to get an agreement to get a vote at 5:45 on the McCain amendment.

RECESS

Mr. LOTT. Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate recess until 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senate stands in recess until the hour of 1:30 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 12:47 p.m., the Senate recessed until 1:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FRIST).

LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 1060.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I know this afternoon we will be focusing on the lobbying disclosure reform effort. Senator FEINGOLD and I, of course, are strong supporters of that,

as are Senators LEVIN and COHEN, and others.

I ask unanimous consent that we might have up to 15 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPREHENSIVE GIFT BAN LEGISLATION

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this is a discussion the Senator and I choose to have now, possibly tonight, and then I would imagine through tomorrow as well. We will be involved in I think a major debate about the gift ban reform effort.

I thought that the Senator from Wisconsin and I might talk a little bit about what is at issue here. I will start out for a few moments, and then we will go back and forth. I have some questions which I want to put to the Senator, and I think he has some questions he wants to put to me as well.

Mr. President, just to be crystal clear, there is no question in my mind that people in the country really, as I have said before, yearn for a political process that they can believe in, one that really is accountable, that is open, and that has real integrity.

We have been working on a gift ban. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin how long we have been working on this comprehensive gift ban legislation with Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator LEVIN.

Mr. FEINGOLD. It seems like we have been talking about it for about 2 years. We sort of came to this in different ways. I got here in the Senate, and I just knew that as a State senator from Wisconsin, we had a law that said you cannot even accept a cup of coffee from a lobbyist. I understood that in the 10 years I was in the State senate. I was a little surprised to find out they did otherwise here.

So we put this in effect for myself and my staff, and then I found out independently that the Senator from Minnesota, from another reform-minded State, was working an overall bill that would apply that to all Members of Congress. We obviously crossed paths and thought that would make sense as part of a broader effort to try to get the influence of big private money a little bit more out of Washington. We got other supporters as time went on. That is how it really started.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me go on to say to my colleague that we have become close friends. We come from a similar part of the country, and we come from reform-minded States.

It is interesting. I became interested in this initiative because shortly after I had been elected, I was on a plane. A guy came up to me, without using any names, by the way. I will not for a moment say there was anything about the conversation that I would call corrupt. But he came up to me and asked me whether I liked athletics. I said, "I love

athletics. My children and I have been involved in athletics, and Sheila and I just love it." He said, "Senator, we would be very pleased for you to have tickets. We represent a certain industry, and we have tickets for all sorts of different games," and everything else. I thanked him. Then I sat down and started thinking to myself. I was a college teacher for 20 years. I had been on this plane, you know, a few times and nobody had ever come up to me and asked that point. I thought, What is it that has changed? It must be the institutional position.

Mr. FEINGOLD. If the Senator will yield, I had a similar experience when I first became a member of the Wisconsin State Senate. Nobody had ever come up to me on the State capitol ground and said, "Senator, do you like lobster?" About a week after being a member of the State senate, one of the lobbyists came up, put his arm around me, and said, "We are just delighted to have you here, Senator. Do you and your wife enjoy lobster tail?" It took me about a minute to realize what was going on. Being from Wisconsin, that was illegal. It is not, though, at the Federal level. But it sort of dawns on you that suddenly people are a little more interested in socializing and buying you dinner possibly because you have been elected to public office.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me go on and engage in a discussion with my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, about what is at issue here. S. 101 is the comprehensive gift ban measure.

By the way, Mr. President, 88 Senators—the Senator from Tennessee would be excluded because he was not in the Senate or the House last Congress—but 88 Senators voted for exactly S. 101, this comprehensive gift ban initiative.

Again, I say to my colleague, it is extremely important in terms of the public, in terms of our connection with the people we represent, that people hold strong with this position. One of features of S. 101 on the gift ban is that we simply say when it comes to lobbying—let us just talk about that—there are just no gifts, period. We have a \$20 minimum.

The McConnell initiative allows lobbyists to give Members an unlimited number of gifts up to \$100 each. As it turns out, I thought at one point in time that this meant every day a lobbyist could take the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Minnesota out for a meal here in Washington, dinner in Washington, or a ticket to an Orioles game, or whatever the case might be, and that every single day, as long as it was up to \$100, it could be done in perpetuity because there is not even an aggregate limit.

Now, as it turns out, it is per occasion—breakfast, lunch, dinner, much less all sorts of things per occasion. Lobbyists can give us gifts as long as it is under \$100, and there is no aggregate limit.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I would like to quantify that example. Under the strictest interpretation of the McConnell proposal, the one that would change S. 101, even if you interpreted it to mean that you could only give \$100 a day of food and wine and so on, it would mean that every lobbyist and every individual could give each Member of Congress \$36,500 of those kinds of things. And is not the Senator really saying that is not even what it means, that it is worth more than that, more than \$100 a day per person for everyone in the universe, for every Member of the Congress?

Mr. WELLSTONE. The \$100 adds up to \$36,500 a year.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Per person.

Mr. WELLSTONE. So actually we do not even have a \$36,500 limit.

Mr. FEINGOLD. That is the strictest interpretation.

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is the strictest interpretation of what we have in the McConnell-Dole initiative.

I say to my colleague from Wisconsin that I would view this not as a great step forward but a great leap backward.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I agree. If the Senator will yield, you can argue that this is just slightly tougher than current law that says that if a gift is over \$100, or a meal is over \$100 and it is less than \$250, I guess you can accept it but you are banned from over \$250. But the contributions under \$100 do not count. They do not count toward that. This puts into the law forever a permission, a right, if you will, to take anything up to \$100 a day from everyone.

So it really is worse because it formalizes potentially in a statute as opposed to a resolution, depending on how it comes out, this practice as something that is permitted and maybe even encouraged in Washington.

Mr. WELLSTONE. So this alternative McConnell-Dole proposal, in the name of reform, in many ways essentially solidifies, if you will, the culture of politics as we know it right now in the Nation's Capital.

Let me go on and ask my colleague a couple of other questions.

By the way, I would say this alternative proposal that we have takes us a long way from I think what the majority leader on October 15 of last year said, which was that "no lobbyists' lunches, no entertainment, no travel, no contributions to legal defense funds, no fruit baskets, no nothing."

This proposal that we now get from the other side certainly takes us a long way from that.

The second part of this proposal would allow privately financed vacation trips in the form of charity golf, tennis and ski events to be accepted by Members from lobbyists, as I think we could accept that for ourselves, our spouses, our family.

I would ask my colleague. This is the alternative proposal. Does he see this as reform or does he see this as having that sort of, if you will, look of reform

but, again, an open-ended proposition where we have lobbyists and special interests paying for skiing, paying for tennis, or paying for vacations for ourselves and our families?

Mr. FEINGOLD. If the Senator will yield, I think he correctly identified the other day that there are two provisions in this McConnell proposal that really gut the bill from having the name "reform" properly attached to it.

You can call anything you want reform—welfare reform or health care reform. Unless it changes things positively, it is not that.

Really, these two provisions, the one the Senator talked about in terms of \$100 a day and the allowing of charitable trips to be determined not by an across-the-board rule or any real standards but just by the Senate Ethics Committee, which is, of course, controlled and in fact is constituted by Members of the Senate, it means you are really not taking away any sort of strict rule that says we are not going to allow that at all.

So I think the combination of those two provisions makes it impossible to call this reform but at best window dressing, and I think the American public would be very distressed to learn what is still permitted under either the travel portion or the meals and gift provisions.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Wisconsin that if we want to as Senators support different charities, I think it is important we be there at these events. I think there is a way in which Senators, Democrats, and Republicans alike, have an important role to play. But the point is we should do that on our own expense. If we care enough about those charities, then we pay our own way.

I think that is the point. We do not need to have lobbyists paying our way, in which case then it becomes another big loophole. It seems to me, I say to my colleague from Wisconsin—I would be interested in his reaction—and I said this earlier in the Chamber, I am not interested in across-the-board denigration of public service. I believe in public service. So does my colleague from Wisconsin. So do Republicans and Democrats alike.

It seems to me we ought to let go of these special favors, these perks, these gifts. We ought to let go of it. If you want people to believe in us, if you want people to believe in the outcome of this process, if you want people to have more confidence in the Senate and in the House and in politics in Washington, DC, then let go of these gifts. Would my colleague agree with me?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I agree. I cannot believe that this great institution wants to continue to have its reputation and its history really being besmirched by some of these "Prime Time" programs and others that are able to take what perhaps is an isolated instance in the

case of certain Members of Congress and show them playing tennis with lobbyists and just cast doubt on the whole institution. There have been enough problems already. I really have to believe that this institution will rise up and say we do not want this.

In fact, I say to the Senator from Minnesota, even the lobbyists do not really want this in a lot of cases. I flew out here this morning and two or three of the prominent lobbyists from Wisconsin said, "We hope you win on this thing." They are tired of this expectation that if one telecommunications giant takes somebody out to dinner, does not the other one have to. So they want to be free of this. They want to be professionals, most of them, as well.

If we just have a *per se* rule as in Wisconsin—lobbyists cannot do it; legislators cannot do it—it frees everyone from this sort of murky question of should I really do that even though it does not look very good and seems inappropriate? It is very important for everyone involved. I think in most cases people have the best intentions here. We need the *per se* rule and should not leave it up to the Senate Ethics Committee to say this charity or that trip makes sense or does not.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin makes an interesting point. I am a little embarrassed that I did not make this point earlier, which is that you talk to many of the lobbyists and they say they would be pleased to see this pass. So in a way, this comprehensive gift ban proposal—I said comprehensive, S. 101 we have been working on. I did not say the alternative, the McConnell-Dole alternative, which frankly does not pass the credibility test. It is not comprehensive. It is not strict and it does not put an end to this practice. I think people will be very angry with it, and therefore I hope actually in the next 2 days we will have reached some agreement that all of us can pass something of which we are proud. Otherwise, it would be a gigantic debate.

If I could just make one additional point, I think this comprehensive gift ban proposal is important, first of all, for the public so they can have more confidence in our process, for all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, and for the lobbyists. And I say to my colleague from Wisconsin, for me the issue has never been the wrongdoing of an individual office holder. I am glad the Senator put it the way he did. I am not interested in some of these exposes—this, that and the other—which I think kind of miss the mark. I do not see—and I hope I am right—the wrongdoing of a lot of individual office holders, but I think there is a more serious problem and it is systemic.

What this is all about, this comprehensive gift ban proposal is all about, is the fact that some people have too much access. They have too much say over what we do in the Senate and too many people in Wisconsin and Minnesota and Tennessee and

Michigan are left out of the loop. People do not like that. They do not feel well represented. They do not like the idea that certain lobbyists and special interests that those lobbyists represent have so much clout here and they are left out.

That is another reason why I think we have to pass a tough comprehensive gift ban reform. Would my colleague agree that there is campaign finance, there is lobbying disclosure, and there is gift ban—all of these reform measures are almost more important than each of them singularly?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would agree. I like to call it the circle of special influence in Washington. There are different links in the chain: the gift problem, the campaign finance problem, and the problem of the revolving door, where Members of Congress or their staff members work here and then go to work for special interests and lobbying back right away.

It is only one part of it, the gift ban. But one of the things that bothers me about this gift issue that the Senator mentions is the fact that this involves the access issue. There is a serious problem for any Member of the Senate. The Senator and I represent millions of people. It is so hard to equitably balance distributing your own time for your constituents. It is obviously difficult to meet with them individually. If there is something out there, whether it be trips or meals, that involves a substantial amount of extra time for certain people because they happen to provide these certain things, that distorts our ability to equitably spend time with constituents.

I think it is embarrassing to even have to come out on the floor and talk about this. It seems to me to be so simple that we should just ban it. It is not that we have not wanted to dispose of it. I can assure you the Senator from Minnesota and I and the Senator from Michigan would like nothing better than to have this over with. We do not want opportunity after opportunity to debate this. But there has been a real effort, frankly, under both Republican and Democrat leadership, to move this issue off to the side. We want it resolved.

I would like to just have to no longer be able to point out to people that in my office we have received in the last 2½ years—and this is sort of the small part of this, but it is the really silly part of it—1,072 gifts, from inexpensive calendars to coffee mugs, T-shirts, motor oil, spark plugs, cast iron bookends, a Japanese mask, fruit baskets, cakes, cheese, pecans, sausage, eggs, steaks, almonds, onions, garlic, honey, bread, peaches, sweet potatoes, sugar, chocolate, candy bars, tea, coffee, dates, barley mustard, wine, Girl Scout cookies, and three lollipops.

Do people not have better things to do than to prepare these little packages for Members of the Senate and the House so they can say that they, too, have handed out some goodies to the

Senators' offices? We have serious business to do here. For our staff members to be bothered with 1,072 of these little well-intentioned gifts is just another example how this process does not make sense. And if we just banned it, we would be able to focus more clearly on what we should really be doing, which is the work of the people who elected us.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, we have about used up our time. Let me just close this way. The New York Times—I do not know if my colleague saw this—on Saturday had an editorial called "Republican Gift Fraud." And quite frankly—and we have not even begun to look at the Republican proposal, or at least the McConnell proposal—there are enough loopholes in here to drive huge trucks through. I think it is very dangerous to call something reform which in fact maintains this current practice of enabling lobbyists and other professional interests to give us gifts, gifts that we receive and take.

I do not think that will do a thing to restore public confidence in the process, and in fact I think people will be furious to not see this practice ended.

Mr. FEINGOLD. If the Senator will yield, I just want to say that I remember—the Senator and I talked about this—the biggest cheer we heard in the lobby out here in the reception area last year was the moment when the gift ban was defeated. There was a cheer that went up in the room apparently from some of the interests that were involved in this. I can assure you, based on the points made about the McConnell amendment, if that passes, it will again be a victory for those who want to continue the current system. It cannot possibly be called reform, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I agree. Let me conclude with an editorial today. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVE IT'S NOT FOR SALE

Once again, supporters of ethics reforms see the U.S. Senate trying to save an endangered species: the congressional freebie. This week the Senate is bound to act on the long-diverted lobbyist gift ban sponsored by five persistent senators, including Paul Wellstone of Minnesota and Russ Feingold of Wisconsin.

This gift ban measure should pass as is. In fact it has passed previously, only to be put aside in the service of political goals and to mollify senators who believe that free football tickets and golf vacations come with the job.

For all the talk over the last few years about reforms in how Congress conducts itself, it is obvious that the assumption of special privilege is the province of neither a Republican- nor Democratic-led federal legislature. The assumption of personal privilege for lawmakers is so embedded in the institution's culture that giving up perks ordinary citizens do not enjoy has become as

tough as balancing the federal budget. Making the matter more difficult is the fact that senators know they have to be "for ethics reform." So the politics of freebies involves diversion and dilution. The anti-reform dynamic aims to stop a comprehensive ban by pushing one that meets appearances of reform without reducing the flow of trips and free meals.

Also designed to weigh against a comprehensive gift ban is one of the parliamentarian's oldest tricks: send a controversial issue to a committee to be chewed up. The Senate's bipartisan task force on lobbying reform has the potential to assure that the sugary river of senatorial gifts is drawn down one hummingbird-sized sip at a time.

The comprehensive gift ban may cramp some senators' style, but it is an important step in restoring public confidence. The current climate about politics and its practitioners says the Senate must prove it is not for sale, one member at a time, to special interests that provide seats on the 50-yard line and a winter break in the tropics.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this is from the St. Paul Pioneer Press, a paper that both of us in Wisconsin and Minnesota receive. The last paragraph reads as follows:

The comprehensive gift ban may cramp some Senators' style, but it is an important step in restoring public confidence. The current climate about politics and its practitioners says the Senate must prove it is not for sale, one Member at a time, to special interests that provide seats on the 50-yard line and winter break in the tropics.

That is stated quite directly. I think the Pioneer Press speaks for the vast majority of people in the country. Some of it may be perception. I do not always assume because people take gifts that that leads to some sort of awful private deals that take place between lobbyists and Senators. I do not make that assumption at all.

But I say to my colleagues, it is time to let go of these perks. It is time to let go of these privileges. It is time to no longer take these gifts. It is time to no longer have lobbyists pay for vacations for ourselves and our spouses, and we ought to end this. It is time to restore some confidence on the part of the people we represent in this political process.

A lot of our colleagues think that we are the only ones interested in these issues. That is not true. People in the country care fiercely about this. I hope in the next couple of days that there will be lobbying disclosure reform, gift ban reform—maybe there will be give and take, I say to my colleague. Maybe we will come together around some initiatives that will not be everything we want, but I do not think either one of us or any of us who have worked on gift ban are going to accept a proposal that does not meet the test of representing significant reform.

Then eventually—and I thank my colleague for his work on this—we will get to campaign finance reform. When we reform this political process, we will be dealing with the root issue, and the root issue is many, many people in the United States of America have lost confidence in the Nation's Capitol. They do not believe this Capitol be-

longs to them. By God, we have to make sure it does—we have to make sure not only they believe it, but that that is the case, this Capitol belongs to them. This is only one step in that direction, but it is an important one. I hope all of our colleagues will support comprehensive gift ban reform.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CHILDREN OF BOSNIA

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I think it is fairly clear that we are heading toward some kind of a military climax in the Bosnian situation. Precisely what is going to happen I do not know. None of us knows. But there is likely to be more bloodshed in the immediate future, and I hope not a continuation of the constant agony and bloodshed that we have seen these past few years since 1991.

I have a citizen from Illinois by the name of Al Booth who says we took children out of Germany, Austria, and England in the very difficult years prior to and during World War II, saved a great many people, and that we ought to be doing something to save the children of Bosnia today.

It is not simple. I have talked to Bosnian officials. My office has talked to the International Red Cross people. The Red Cross people said if you had taken them out by bus or by any kind of vehicle or by plane, and the plane is shot, there would be substantial criticism. There are at least some in the Bosnian Government who feel that to take the children out almost means you are sending a signal that the Government cannot continue, that it is going to collapse. It is a difficult situation.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Al Booth that was printed in the Chicago Tribune about this situation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 19, 1995]

BOSNIA'S CHILDREN

CHICAGO.—The children of Bosnia should not be allowed to become the slaughtered innocent victims of the intensified fighting.

In 1937 a kindertransport was organized in Germany, before Hitler closed the door, when the British government made 10,000 visas available for German children. Seven thousand children were rescued—75 percent Jewish and 25 percent Christian. (Only 1,000 children arrived in the U.S. from Germany—with parents, relatives or alone—in 1938 and 1939.)

Several European countries are organized to accept refugee children. There they would be closer to home. These countries are very experienced on matters relating to refugees.

The UN is in the best position to organize the transfer of children of any ethnic group out of Bosnia. To do so at this time would certainly make it plain to those forces attacking the "safe havens" that at long last the NATO countries and the U.S. wish to put an end to using snipers to kill children and mortars to kill civilians. The Air Force would be there to protect the children.

We may not be able to stop ethnic violence or expanded civil wars, but we should be able, at this moment, to take the initiative to remove children and women.

A kindertransport program is long overdue in Bosnia. Those children who came out of Germany and Austria left their parents behind, and almost all never saw their parents again. We have a better chance of that not happening this time, but we must get the children out of Bosnia now, before they become orphans and victims.

AL BOOTH,
President,
International Music Foundation.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, in response to that letter, he received a letter from the consul general of France. Let me just read two paragraphs from this letter. The consul general read Al Booth's letter in the Chicago Tribune:

In addition to its participation in the organization of an air shuttle in Sarajevo and the creation of a central pharmacy in Bihac, the French Government evacuated more than 200 Bosnian children between 1993 and 1994.

Furthermore, a private association called "Equilibre," with the support of our Regional Councils, organized in November '92 the temporary evacuation of 1045 mothers and children. This operation was repeated in 1994 for 1000 children and their mothers.

For a total of 2,045.

This time the operation concentrated on the children whose health was failing and who could not have spent the winter in Bosnia.

He says these operations would not have been possible without the support of the French Government in particular regarding the retention of temporary permits for the accompanying adults.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of the French Consul General.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSULAT GENERAL DE FRANCE,
Chicago, IL, July 11, 1995.

MR. AL BOOTH,
International Music Foundation, Chicago, IL.

DEAR MR. BOOTH: I read with much interest your letter published in the Chicago Tribune of June 19, 1995, and sent a copy to the French Foreign Ministry, who have provided me with the following information.

In addition to its participation in the organization of an air shuttle in Sarajevo and the creation of a central pharmacy in Bihac, the French Government evacuated more than 200 Bosnian children between 1993 and 1994.

Furthermore, a private association called "Equilibre," with the support of our Regional Councils, organized in November '92 the temporary evacuation of 1045 mothers and children. This operation was repeated in 1994 for 1,000 children and their mothers. This time the operation concentrated on the children whose health was failing and who could not have spent the winter in Bosnia.